RES MILITARIS
REVUE EUROPEENNE D ETUDES EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF MILITARY STUDIES
Social Science Journal

The Impact Of Bureaucratic Integrity And Loyalty On Government's Institutional Performance

By

Ismet Sulila
Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Indonesia
E-mail: ismet.sulila@ung.ac.id

Sartika Dewi Usman
Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Indonesia

Abstract

This research was carried out from October to December 2021. The government's institutional performance in Indonesia is initiated to create professional, result-oriented, and accountable government institutions through the application of performance management principles, performance-based budgeting, and performance measures. This current research aims to examine the impact of bureaucratic integrity and bureaucratic loyalty on the government's institutional performance, either partially or simultaneously. The approach employed in this current research is quantitative where its method applies ex post facto method, and the design used is causality. The technique of data analysis uses multiple regression. The research findings reveal that (1) the bureaucratic integrity owns a positive and significant impact on the government's institutional performance with a coefficient of determination of 24.60%, (2) the bureaucratic loyalty owns a positive and significant impact on the career development of State Civil Apparatus with a coefficient of determination of 50.20%, and (3) simultaneously, the bureaucratic integrity and bureaucratic loyalty own a significant impact on the government's institutional performance in Gorontalo Province with a coefficient of determination of 74.80%. In the meantime, the remaining 25.20% is elucidated by other variables which are not examined in this research, such as work motivation, work ethic, employee competence, performance allowances, and employee career management.

Keywords: institutional performance, bureaucratic integrity and bureaucratic loyalty

Introduction

The performance of public sector is a representation of the overall institutional value to meet the defined needs of each relevant group through systemic efforts and continuously improve institutional capabilities to achieve their needs effectively and efficiently. Performance can also be noticed as the potential possessed by all State Civil Apparatus to carry out every task and responsibility assigned by the work unit organization. Individual performance will be accumulated into group performance. Meanwhile, the group performance will be accumulated into organizational performance (Adi, 2018). Performance is the real foundation in an organization due to without performance, the goals of organization cannot be achieved (El Araby & Ayaad, 2020). Performance should be used as an evaluation material for leaders to find out the high and low performance in the organization. The term organizational performance is often confused with the term institutional performance. Theoretically, Fryer (Fryer et al., 2009) states that institutional performance indicators are observable from 1) Strategic congruence, 2) Validity, 3) Reliability, and 4) Acceptability. In public organizations,

performance is often observed from the aspect of program achievements in a certain period (Ariño, 2003). The higher the realization of achievements, the higher the performance generated by the organization. Institutional performance in one period will be a reference and evaluation material for institutions in determining policy directions and efforts to improve results in the future. The public sector performance is pivotal in 1) helping to improve government performance, 2) being used for resource allocation and decision making, 3) realizing public accountability and improving institutional communication of multidimensional public sector performance, 4) providing direction to achieve predetermined performance targets, 5) monitoring and evaluating performance achievement and comparing it with performance targets and taking corrective actions to improve performance, 6) being basis for providing reward and punishment objectively as measured by agreed performance measures, and 7) being a decision-making tool which is carried out objectively.

The concept of integrity must be discussed so that we can understand what integrity really is along with its basic idea. By understanding the concept of integrity, the importance of it is more obvious in the community especially for stakeholders, in an effort to prevent violation of law in their environment, such as KKN (Corruption, Collusion, Nepotism) (Sihombing, 2018). The state of behaving with integrity should be performed not only because of the demand of a job, but also in a state that the individual understands well that having integrity is part of the process of creating a better improvement in the family, organization, or country. The description of someone with integrity is by looking at the person's behavior. Behaviors with integrity include (Killinger, 2007) : a) honest; b) consistent between speech and action; c) comply with organizational rules and ethics; d) uphold commitments and principles that are believed to be true; e) responsible for the actions, decisions, and risks; f) the individual quality to be respected by others; g) consistent adherence to the moral principles prevailing in society; and h) wise in distinguishing right and wrong and encourage others to do the same. The previous behavioral indicators illustrate that someone with integrity is considered someone who can be relied on and trusted. Integrity is actively internalized as a sense of wholeness and balance in individuals who are aware of their own context and have moral beliefs and are consistent in manifesting them into behavior, without having to feel ashamed and dare to spread their beliefs. This dynamic process will lead the individual towards the fulfillment of self-identity with moral responsibility and grateful action. Integrity is a dynamic psychological construct based on a well-functioning personality which is managed by cognitive and affective function, and is supported by a certain ability to manifest it into integrity behavior. This understanding depicts that integrity is inherent in individuals as part of their life processes (Huberts, 2018). A person is recognized to have "integrity" if his actions are in accordance with the values, beliefs, and principles he holds. Without integrity, motivation is dangerous; without motivation, capacity is powerless; without capacity, understanding is limited; without understanding, knowledge is meaningless; and without knowledge, experience is blind.

According to Haryatmoko 2011, integrity is firmness in principles and attitudes not to commit corruption and other corrupt actions. Integrity is needed in public services, where Jeremy (Jeremy, 2003) utters that public services are not optimal where one of which is due to the public services that do not have integrity and corrupt behavior, thus it requires an improvement as good public service is one way to prevent corruption. Meanwhile, according to Mutiarin (Mutiarin, 2012), the integrity of public services can be interpreted as a form of government commitment to provide excellent service to the community by prioritizing integrity and morality as the basis for realizing good and clean governance where it is government commitment as provider and community as service users. (Halili & Mochtar,

2009) the integrity is measured by applying the following standard operating procedures (a) existence of good and adhered to procedures, (b) establishment of responsible public service officers' behavior, (c) availability of facilities and infrastructure to support public service procedures. Integrity is a value, an aspiration, but also contextually a coherent norm (Sellars, 2020). Integrity is also related to the ability to diagnose integrity gaps, identify problems with ethical considerations, have legal knowledge, and have commitment, belief, and moral responsibility (Govekar & Nelly Trevinyo-Rodreguez, 2007).

Loyalty in an organization is an important aspect that must be owned by employees. (Hajdin, 2005) Hajdin suggests that loyalty is one of the elements used in employee appraisal which includes loyalty to the job, position, and organization. Employee loyalty will also determine the survival of an organization and can affect the future progress of an organization (Dutta & Dhir, 2021). Oliver 1999, defines loyalty as the tendency of an employee not to leave and move to another company due to the comfort of employees in working in a company is impacted by the loyalty. In addition, (Guillon & Cezanne, 2014) loyalty is reflected by the willingness of employees to maintain and defend the organization inside and outside of work from irresponsible people. Employees who are not loyal to the company are characterized by negative feelings, such as wanting to leave the company, feeling that working in another company is more profitable, not feeling the benefits of the company, and regretting their decision to join the company (Yee et al., 2010). Loyalty can be interpreted as loyalty, devotion, and trust given or addressed to a person or institution (Chen et al., 2022). Mowday *et al.,* 1982, argue that: first, loyalty to the company which is as an attitude or the extent to which an employee identifies his workplace as indicated by the desire to work and perform well, and second, loyalty to the company which is as behavior or the process by which an employee makes a definite decision not to leave the company if he does not make extreme mistakes. Loyalty is an employees' mental attitude that is shown in the existence of the company (Meschke, 2021). The support provided by employees within the company for actions that are expected to ensure success and survival, even though these actions are contrary to the aspirations of employees (Mowday et al., 1979). In reference to the several definitions of loyalty from previous experts, the researcher concludes that employee loyalty is reflected in the attitudes and actions of devoting abilities and expertise, carrying out tasks with responsibility, discipline, being honest at work, and creating good working relationship.

Loyalty Measurement Indicator states that employee loyalty has several indicator elements (Bobâlcă et al., 2012) including: 1) obedience and compliance, 2) responsibility, 3) devotion, and 4) honesty. Employee loyalty can be defined as dedication, trust, and also loyalty given to an individual or a company or organization, with full responsibility to always behave well (McMullan & Gilmore, 2003). Loyalty is a strong ability and determination to try to carry out tasks, and to obey all regulations with self-awareness and full sense of responsibility (Pritchard et al., 1992). To conclude, employee loyalty is loyalty, trust, dedication and determination given by an employee to try to obey the regulations, be disciplined, be honest, and be responsible at work. Aspects of loyalty to individuals are expressed by (Zdaniuk & Levine, 2001) which cover: a. Compliance with the rules, b. Responsibility, c. Willingness to cooperate, d. Sense of belonging, e. Interpersonal relation, and f. Having love for work. Loyalty appears as it is impacted by: a. Personal characteristics, b. Job characteristics, c. Company design characteristics, and d. Experience gained (Church, 1993).

In accordance with Law Number 38 of 2000 concerning the Establishment of Gorontalo Province, dated December 22, 2000, Gorontalo Province which is an expansion area, is the 32nd province in Indonesia. In an effort to improve integrity and loyalty, the Gorontalo Provincial Government implemented Circular Letter No. 22 of 2021 from the Ministry of State Apparatus Empowerment. The strategic steps in the circular letter include encouraging the implementation of seven core values of the State Civil Apparatus encompassing Results-oriented, Accountable, Competent, Harmonious, Loyal, Adaptive, and Collaborative. The seven core values above are expected to generate state civil apparatus that has integrity and loyalty so as to improve the government's institutional performance. The implementation of Circular Letter No. 22 of 2021 has emphasized that institutional performance can be improved through integrity and loyalty. Therefore, it is interesting to study how the impact of integrity and loyalty on institutional performance. Based on the previous background, this present research deals with the following questions: 1) Does bureaucratic integrity impact the government's institutional performance? 2) Does bureaucratic loyalty impact the government's institutional performance? And 3) Do bureaucratic integrity and loyalty impact the government's institutional performance?

Materials And Method

The research entitled The Impact of Bureaucratic Integrity and Bureaucratic Loyalty on the Government's Institutional Performance in the Gorontalo Provincial Government is done by initially distributing research questionnaires to respondents, in this case, the respondents are employees who have met the sample standards. The data in this research are primary data obtained by using a questionnaire distributed directly to respondents.

The number of respondents who became research subjects was 39 respondents where they have met the predetermined research sample standards. Of the total number of questionnaires distributed, 39 were returned, and 39 of which could be used. The questionnaire that was used (response use) was 100%. The respondents in this research were 39 people where the highest score was 5 and the lowest score was 1. So the results of calculation of respondents' answers are presented as follows: Max = 5 X 39 = 195 (100%); Min=1 X 39 = 39 (20.00%); and Range = (195-39)/5 = 31.20 (16.00%). Therefore, in reference to the range of scale, an assessment was made (referring to Narimawati, 2007: 85) as denoted in the following table:

Table 1. Interpretation of Score

No	Score Percentage	Criterion
1	20,00% - 36,00%	Very Bad
2	36,01% - 52,00%	Bad
3	52,01% - 68,00%	Less Good
4	68,01% - 84,00%	Fairly Good
5	84,01% - 100,00%	Good

Source: Processed Data, 2021

In reference to the previous table, criteria of each statement, indicator, and variable are identifiable. Meanwhile, the result of descriptive analysis from all research variables are as follows:

Variable of Bureaucratic Integrity (X_1)

The result of respondents' answer is used to find out the respondents' perception towards variable of bureaucratic integrity which is presented in the following table:

Table 2. Analysis of Respondents' Answer towards Variable of Bureaucratic Integrity (X_1)

No	Indicator	Score			Criterion
		Actual	Ideal	%	
1	Coherence of Norms	844	975	86.56%	Good
2	Ethical Principles	811	975	83.18%	Fairly Good
3	Integrity Behavior	796	975	81.64%	Fairly Good
4	Integrity Education	813	975	83.38%	Fairly Good
Total		**3,264**	**3,900**	**83.69%**	**Fairly Good**

Source: Processed Data, 2021

Based on the previous table, it is noticeable that the bureaucratic integrity variable is in the "fairly good" criterion with a score of 83.69%. The result indicates that employees in the Gorontalo Provincial Government have a fairly good perception towards bureaucratic integrity in an effort to achieve a good government institutional performance.

Variable of Bureacratice Loyalty (X2)

The respondents' answer is used to find out the respondents' perception towards variable of bureaucratic loyalty which is presented in table 3 :

Table 3. Analysis of Respondents' Answer towards Variable of Bureaucratic Loyalty (X_2)

No	Indicator	Score			Criterion
		Actual	Ideal	%	
1	Obedience and Compliance	798	975	81.85%	Fairly Good
2	Responsibility	765	975	78.46%	Fairly Good
3	Dedication	732	975	75.08%	Fairly Good
4	Honesty	751	975	77.03%	Fairly Good
Total		**3,046**	**3,900**	**78.10%**	**Fairly Good**

Source: Processed Data, 2021

Based on the table above, it is noticeable that the bureaucratic loyalty variable is in the "fairly good" criterion with a score of 78.10%. The result indicates that there is a conducive working climate and atmosphere within the Gorontalo Provincial Government which enable employees to work effectively and efficiently. Bureaucratic loyalty strongly supports the entire work process to be able to run according to the plan because it will create better cooperation among employees.

Variable of Government's Institutional Performance (Y)

The respondents' answer is used to find out the respondents' perception towards variable of Government's Institutional Performance which is presented in the following table:

Table 4. Analysis of Respondents' Answer towards Variable of Government's Institutional Performance (Y)

No	Indicator	Score			Criterion
		Actual	Ideal	%	
1	Strategic Congruence	831	975	85.23%	Good
2	Validity	787	975	80.72%	Fairly Good
3	Reliability	797	975	81.74%	Fairly Good
4	Acceptability	844	975	86.56%	Good
	Total	**3,259**	**3,900**	**83.56%**	**Fairly Good**

Source: Processed Data, 2021

Based on the table above, it is noticeable that the institutional performance variable is in the "fairly good" criterion with a score of 83.56%. The result indicates that the Gorontalo Provincial government has adequate institutional performance in accordance with the ideal performance criteria for the organization. The government's institutional performance is a representation of employee performance which still must be improved, especially performance in achieving valid performance in accordance with the specified work quality. Therefore, an important factor in growing optimal institutional performance is the achievement of employee work performance that can be supported by ideal and conducive bureaucratic integrity and bureaucratic loyalty in a work environment in government institutions.

Findings And Discussion

Validity and Reliability Tests

The quality of the data for the instruments in this present research is analyzed by testing their validity and reliability. The test is carried out on 30 employees outside of the sample in the Gorontalo Provincial government.

Instrument Validity Test

The results of validity test of each variable can be observed as follows:

Variable of Bureaucratic Integrity (X1)

The number of statements used to measure bureaucratic integrity in this current research was 20 in 30 respondents (**n=30**). The results of validity test towards the statement discovered of the 20 statements used to measure the impact of bureaucratic integrity variable, all statements had an r_{count} value that was higher than r_{table} of 0.361, so that it has met the validity test and could be used to collect the research data.

Variable of Bureaucratic Loyalty (X2)

The number of statements used to measure the impact of bureaucratic loyalty in this current research was 20 in 30 respondents (**n=30**). The results of validity of test towards the statement discovered that of the 20 statements used to measure the impact of bureaucratic loyalty variable, all statements had an r_{count} value that was higher than r_{table} of 0.361, so that it has met the validity test and could be used to collect the research data.

Variable of Government's Institutional Performance (Y)

The number of statements used to measure the validity of institutional performance in this research was 20 in 30 respondents (n=30). The results of the validity test towards the statement discovered that of the 20 statements used to measure the impact of the government's institutional performance variable, all statements had rcount value that was higher than rtable of 0.361 so that it has met the validity test and could be used to collect the research data.

Instrument Reliability Test

According to Ghozali (2013: 89), if Cronbach's alpha value is more than or equal to 0.6, then the variable is reliable and vice versa. The results of reliability test of each variable can be observed as follows:

Variable of Bureaucratic Integrity (X1)

The number of statements used to measure bureaucratic integrity in this research is 20. The reliability test of the statement is presented in table 8:

Table 8. Results of Reliability Test towards Variable of Bureaucratic Integrity

Variable	Reliability Coefficient	Reference Number	Information	Status
Bureaucratic Integrity	0,897	0,6	Value of *Cronbach Alpa* > 0,6	Reliable

Source: Processed data of SPSS 21, 2021

In reference to the results of analysis using the Croncbach alpha technique as presented in the previous table for the bureaucratic integrity variable, the reliability coefficient value is 0.897. The coefficient value of Cronbach's Alpha is higher than 0.6 which shows that a valid bureaucratic integrity instrument has a good consistency.

Variable of Bureaucratic Loyalty (X2)

The number of statements used to measure bureaucratic loyalty in this research is 20. The reliability test of the statement is presented in table 9:

Table 9. Results of Reliability Test towards Variable of Bureaucratic Loyalty

Variable	Reliability Coefficient	Reference Number	Information	Status
Bureaucratic Loyalty	0,893	0,6	Value of *Cronbah Alpa* > 0,6	Reliable

Source: Processed data of SPSS 21, 2021

In reference to the results of analysis using the Croncbach alpha technique as presented in the previous table for the bureaucratic loyalty variable, the reliability coefficient value is 0.893. The coefficient value of Cronbach's Alpha is higher than 0.6 which shows that a valid instrument of bureaucratic loyalty has good consistency.

Variable of Government's Institutional Performance (Y)

The number of statements used to measure the reliability of government's institutional performance in this research is 20 in 30 respondents (**n=30)**. The reliability of the statement is presented in table 10:

Table 10. Results of Reliability Test towards Variable of Government's Institutional Performance

Variable	Reliability Coefficient	Reference Number	Information	Status
Government's Institutional Performance	0,883	0,6	Value of *Cronbah Alpa* > 0,6	Reliable

Source: Processed data of SPSS 21, 2021

In reference to the results of the analysis using the Croncbach alpha technique as presented in the previous table for the institutional performance variable, the reliability coefficient value is 0.883. The coefficient value of Cronbach's Alpha is higher than 0.6 which shows that the Government's Institutional Performance instrument in this research can be trusted and can be used for further research.

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The general description of research respondents based on gender is presented in the following table.

Table 11. Distribution of respondents based on Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	5	12.8	12.8	12.8
	Female	34	87.2	87.2	100.0
	Total	39	100.0	100.0	

Source: Processed data of SPSS 21, 2021

Based on the table above, it is noticeable that the number of respondents who are male is as many as 5 people (12.80%). Then for respondents who are female, the are as many as 34 people (87.20%). In brief, the dominant gender characteristics are female respondents.

The demographics of respondents above have become a source of data, which is then carried out in the following stages of data testing.

Classical Assumption Test

Data Normality Test

In regression testing, the main requirement that must be met is that the data must be normally distributed. Normality test can also be identified by the Normal Probability Plot method. The results of Kolmogorov Smirnov One Sample test is observable from the following table:

Table 14. Results of Normality Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		39
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	4.97213772
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.123
	Positive	.123
	Negative	-.071
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.767
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.599

Source: Processed data of SPSS 21, 2021

In reference to the previous table, it is noticeable that the results of normality test of the data (Kolomogorov Smirnov) found that the Unstandardized Residual is 0.767 with a significance level of 0.599. The significance value of the normality test is higher than the alpha value of 0.05, so it is concluded that the Unstandardized Residual data follows a normal distribution.

Multicolinearity

In accordance with the previous data processing, the value of Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for each variable is obtained as indicated in table 15:

Table 15. Result of Multicolinearity Test

Variable	VIF	Conclusion
Bureaucratic Integrity	1,703	Non-Multicolinearity
Bureaucratic Loyalty	1,703	Non-Multicolinearity

Source: Processed data, 2021

In reference to the results of data processing above, it is found that the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value for the bureaucratic integrity variable is 1.703 and for the bureaucratic loyalty variable is 1.703. The value of Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) is lower than the stipulation value (number 10). So it is concluded that the regression model does not have a multicollinearity problem or in other words, the data meet the multicollinearity test.

Heterocedasticity Test

Heteroscedasticity test is a type of test aiming to test the emergence of difference in variance from the existing data residuals in a regression. In reference to the test results, the points spread randomly and are spread both above and below zero on the Y axis. Therefore, it is concluded that the regression model does not occur heteroscedasticity. To support these results, it is necessary to test heteroscedasticity using the Glejser test method. The results of heteroscedasticity test using the glejser method are presented in table: 16

Table 16. Results of Glejser Heterocedasticity Test

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	7.641	3.062		2.495	.017
	Bureaucratic Integrity	-.053	.060	-.187	-.878	.386
	Bureaucratic Loyalty	-.009	.062	-.032	-.152	.880

Source: Processed data of SPSS 21, 2021

In reference to the results of data processing above, it is noticeable that the significance value or Probability Value (P-Value) is 0.386 for the bureaucratic integrity variable and 0.880 for bureaucratic loyalty. The significance value of the test is higher than the alpha value of 0.05. So that in conclusion, the regression model does not have heteroscedasticity problems.

Regression Model Estimation

After conducting classical assumption test and is fulfilled, the next step is data modeling using multiple regression analysis. The results of the analysis are shown in the table as follows:

Table 17. Results of Regression Analysis

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	6.824	5.351		1.275	.210
	Bureaucratic Integrity	.324	.105	.338	3.094	.004
	Bureaucratic Loyalty	.602	.108	.608	5.564	.000

Source: Processed data of SPSS 21, 2021

In accordance with the previous analysis result, the simple linear regression model developed is:

$$\hat{Y} = 6{,}824 + 0{,}324X_1 + 0{,}602X_2 + e$$

In conformity with the regression equation model above, the following elaborations can be interpreted: a) $\alpha = 6.824$. The constant value is a fixed value which means that if there is no impact on bureaucratic integrity and bureaucratic loyalty, then the institutional performance has a constant value of 6.824 units, b) $\beta 1 = 0.324$. The value of Regression Coefficient of Variable X_1 (bureaucratic integrity) is 0.324, indicating that every change in the bureaucratic integrity variable of 1 unit will impact the institutional performance of Gorontalo Provincial government by 0.324 times unit. It is with an assumption that a bureaucratic loyalty variable is a constant value or cateris paribus, c) $\beta 2 = 0.602$. The value of Regression Coefficient of Variable X_2 (bureaucratic loyalty) is 0.602, indicating that every change in the bureaucratic loyalty variable of 1 unit will impact the institutional performance of Gorontalo Provincial government by 0.602 unit. It is with an assumption that Assuming a bureaucratic integrity variable is a constant value or cateris paribus.

Partial Hypothesis Test

After obtaining the regression equation model, the next step is to test the hypothesis. The next test includes determining the hypothesis, determining the significance, determining the test statistics, and determining the test criteria and conclusions. The test results are described as follows:

The Impact of Bureaucratic Integrity on the Government's Institutional Performance

The test results on the impact of bureaucratic integrity on the institutional performance of Gorontalo Provincial government are presented in table 18:

Table 18. Result of Partial Test X1 towards Y

Model	(Constant)	Bureaucratic Integrity (Variable X_1)
Coefficient Value (t-Count)	1.285	**3.084**
Significance	0,210	**0,004**
t_{table}		2,028
Information		Providing significant impact
It has a significant impact due to: 1. Value of t_{count} is higher than value of t_{table} 2. Significance value is lower than alpha value for 0,05 (0,004 < 0,05)		

Source: Processed data of SPSS 21, 2021

The results of the above analysis denote that the t_{count} value for the bureaucratic integrity variable is 3.094, while the t_{table} value is 2.028 at the significance level of 5% and the degree of freedom n-k-1 or 39-2-1=36. If the two t values are compared, the t_{count} value is still higher than the t_{table} value (3,094>2,028). Therefore, it is concluded that at the confidence level of 95%, the bureaucratic integrity has a positive and significant impact on the institutional performance of Gorontalo Province government. In addition, the meaning of positive coefficient indicates that the more ideal the bureaucratic integrity is, the higher the institutional performance of Gorontalo Provincial Government will be.

The Impact of Bureaucratic Loyalty on the Government's Institutional Performance

The test results on the impact of bureaucratic loyalty on the institutional performance of Gorontalo Provincial government are presented in the following table:

Table 19. Result of Partial Test X2 towards Y

Model	(Constant)	Bureaucratic Loyalty (Variable X_2)
Coefficient Value (t-Count)	1.275	**5,564**
Significance	0,210	**0,000**
t_{table}		2,028
Information		Providing significant impact
It has a significant impact due to: 1. Value of t_{count} is higher than value of t_{table} 2. Significance value is lower than alpha value for 0,05 (0,000 < 0,05)		

Source: Processed data of SPSS 21, 2021

The results of the above analysis denote that the t_{count} value for the bureaucratic loyalty variable is 5.564, while the t_{table} value is 2.028 at the significance level of 5% and the degree of freedom n-k-1 or 39-2-1=36. If the two t values are compared, the t_{count} value is still higher than the t_{table} value (5.564>2.028). Therefore, it is concluded that at the confidence level of 95%, bureaucratic loyalty has a positive and significant impact on the institutional performance of Gorontalo Provincial Government. In addition, the meaning of positive coefficient indicates that the more conducive the bureaucratic loyalty in Gorontalo Province government environment, the more institutional performance will increase.

Simultaneous Hypothesis Test

The stages of simultaneous testing include determining hypothesis, determining level of significance, determining test statistics, determining test criteria, and conclusion. The results of simultaneous test in this research can be noticed in table 20:

Table 20. Result of Simultaneous Test

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2783.781	2	1391.890	53.338	.000[b]
	Residual	939.442	36	26.096		
	Total	3723.223	38			

Sumber: Data Olahan SPSS 21, 2021

In reference to the table above, the F_{count} value of the research is 53,338. Meanwhile, the value of F_{table} is 3.259 at a significance level of 5% and df1 of k = 2, and df2 of N-k-1=39-2-1=36. If the two F values are compared, the F_{-count} obtained is much higher than F_{table} so that bureaucratic integrity and bureaucratic loyalty, simultaneously, have a significant impact on the institutional performance of Gorontalo Provincial Government.

Coefficient of Determination

The value of coefficient of determination is a value that ranges from 0%-100%. The following formula is used in this test:

$$r = \frac{n\sum XiYi - \left(\sum Xi\right)\left(\sum Yi\right)}{\sqrt{n\left\{\sum Xi^2 - \left(\sum Xi\right)^2\right\}\left\{n\sum Yi^2 - \left(\sum Yi^2\right)\right\}}}$$

$$CD = r^2 \times 100\%$$

The amount of coefficient of determination (R^2) in this research can be observed in the following table:

Table 21. Coefficient of Determination

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.865[a]	.748	.734	5.10839

Source: Processed data of SPSS 21, 2021

In reference to the results of analysis of the coefficient of determination in the table above, it is noticeable that the impact (the ability of the independent variable to explain the dependent variable) uses an R Square value of 0.748. This value indicates that 74.80% of the variability of institutional performance within Gorontalo Provincial Government can be explained by bureaucratic integrity and bureaucratic loyalty, while the remaining 25.20% can be elucidated by other variables which are not examined in this research. Subsequently, it is continued by conducting a partial coefficient test where its results are described in able 22:

Table 22. Partial Coefficient of Determination

Model	Standardized Coefficients	Correlation	Determination	
			Value	%
Bureaucratic Integrity	0.338	0.729	0.246	24,60%
Bureaucratic Loyalty	0.608	0.825	0.502	50,20%
Simultaneous Coefficient of Determination			0.748	74,80%

Source: Processed data of SPSS 21, 2021

In reference to the results of analysis of the coefficient of determination above, it can be explained by the impact of each of the following variables: 1) bureaucratic integrity. Based on the above calculation, the value of coefficient of determination is 0.246. So that the ability of bureaucratic integrity variable in impacting the institutional performance of Gorontalo Provincial Government is 24.60%, 2) bureaucratic loyalty. Based on the above calculation, the value of coefficient of determination is 0.502. So that the ability of bureaucratic loyalty variable to impact the institutional performance of Gorontalo Provincial Government is 50.20%. The research findings will be described as follows:

The impact of bureaucratic integrity on the government's institutional performance

The test results on the impact of bureaucratic integrity on the institutional performance of Gorontalo Provincial government are presented in table 23:

Table 23. Result of Partial Test X1 towards Y

Model	(Constant)	Bureaucratic Integrity (Variable X_1)
Coefficient Value (t-Count)	1.275	**3.094**
Significance	0,210	**0,004**
t_{table}		2,028
Information		Providing Significant Impact
It has a significant impact due to:		
3. Value of t_{count} is higher than value of t_{table}		
4. Significance value is lower than alpha value for 0,05 (0,004 < 0,05)		

Source: Processed data of SPSS 21, 2021

The results of the above analysis denote that the t_{count} value for the bureaucratic integrity variable is 3.094, while the t_{table} value is 2.028 at the significance level of 5% and the degree of freedom n-k-1 or 39-2-1=36. If the two t values are compared, the t_{count} value is still higher than the t_{table} value (3,094>2,028). Therefore, it is concluded that at the confidence level of 95%, the bureaucratic integrity has a positive and significant impact on the institutional performance of Gorontalo Province government. In addition, the meaning of positive coefficient indicates that the more ideal the bureaucratic integrity is, the higher the institutional performance of Gorontalo Provincial Government will be.

The Impact of Bureaucratic Loyalty on the Government's Institutional Performance

The test results on the impact of bureaucratic loyalty on the institutional performance of Gorontalo Provincial government are presented in table 24:

Table 24. Results of Partial Test X2 towards Y

Model	(Constant)	Bureacratic Loyalty (Variable X_2)
Coefficient Value (t-Count)	1.275	**5,564**
Significance	0,210	**0,000**
t_{table}		2,028
Information		Providing Significant Impact
It has a significant impact due to:		
3. Value of t_{count} is higher than value of t_{table}		
4. Significance value is lower than alpha value for 0,05 (0,000 < 0,05)		

Source: Processed data of SPSS 21, 2021

The results of the above analysis denote that the t_{count} value for the bureaucratic loyalty variable is 5.564, while the t_{table} value is 2.028 at the significance level of 5% and the degree of freedom n-k-1 or 39-2-1=36. If the two t values are compared, the t_{count} value is still higher than the t_{table} value (5.564>2.028). Therefore, it is concluded that at the confidence level of 95%, bureaucratic loyalty has a positive and significant

impact on the institutional performance of Gorontalo Provincial Government. In addition, the meaning of the positive coefficient indicates that the more conducive the bureaucratic loyalty in the Gorontalo Province government environment, the institutional performance will increase.

Simultaneous Hypothesis Test

Table 25. Results of Simultaneous Test

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2783.781	2	1391.890	53.338	.000[b]
	Residual	939.442	36	26.096		
	Total	3723.223	38			

Source: Processed data of SPSS 21, 2021

In accordance with the table above, the F_{count} value of this research is 53,338. Meanwhile, the value of F_{table} is 3.259 at a significance level of 5% and df1 of k = 2, and df2 of N-k-1=39-2-1=36. If these two F values are compared, the F_{-count} obtained is much higher than F_{table} so that the bureaucratic integrity and bureaucratic loyalty, simultaneously, have a significant impact on the institutional performance of Gorontalo Provincial Government..

Coefficient of Determination

The value of the coefficient of determination is a value that ranges from 0%-100%. In this test, the following formula is used:

$$r = \frac{n\sum XiYi - \left(\sum Xi\right)\left(\sum Yi\right)}{\sqrt{\left\{n\sum Xi^2 - \left(\sum Xi\right)^2\right\}\left\{n\sum Yi^2 - \left(\sum Yi^2\right)\right\}}}$$

$$CD = r^2 \times 100\%$$

The amount of coefficient of determination (R^2) in this research can be observed in the following table:

Table 26. Coefficient of Determination

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.865[a]	.748	.734	5.10839

Source: Processed data of SPSS 21, 2021

Based on the results of analysis of the coefficient of determination in the table above, it is noticeable that the impact (the ability of the independent variable to explain the dependent variable) uses an R Square value of 0.748. This value indicates that 74.80% of the variability of institutional performance within Gorontalo Provincial Government can be explained by bureaucratic integrity and bureaucratic loyalty, while the remaining 25.20% can be explained by other variables not examined in this research. Subsequently, it is continued by conducting a partial coefficient test where its results are described in the following table:

Table 27. Partial Coefficient of Determination

Model	Standardized Coefficients	Correlation	Determination Value	Determination %
Bureaucratic Integrity	0.338	0.729	0.246	24,60%
Bureaucratic Loyalty	0.608	0.825	0.502	50,20%
Simultaneous Coefficient of Determination			0.748	74,80%

Source: Processed data of SPSS 21, 2021

In accordance with the results of analysis of the coefficient of determination above, it can be explained by the impact of each of the following variables: based on the calculation above, the value of the coefficient of determination is 0.246. So that the ability of the bureaucratic integrity variable to impact the institutional performance of Gorontalo Provincial Government is 24.60%. In addition, based on the above calculation, the coefficient of determination value is 0.502. So that the ability of the bureaucratic loyalty variable to impact the institutional performance of Gorontalo Provincial Government is 50.20%.

Conclusion

In accordance with the test results, the following conclusions are drawn (1) the bureaucratic integrity has a positive and significant impact on the government's institutional performance, with a coefficient of determination of 24.60%. This shows that the higher the employees' integrity, the performance is shown by the employees will also experience a significant increase, (2) bureaucratic loyalty has a positive and significant impact on the career development of the State Civil Apparatus with a coefficient of determination of 50.20%. This shows that the higher the employees' loyalty, the performance shown by the employees will also experience a significant increase, and (3) simultaneously, the bureaucratic integrity and bureaucratic loyalty have a significant impact on the government's institutional performance in Gorontalo Province with a coefficient of determination of 74.80%. This shows that the higher the integrity and loyalty of the State Civil Apparatus, the performance shown will also experience a significant increase. Furthermore, the percentage of 25.20% can be elucidated by other variables not examined in this research, such as work motivation, work ethic, employee competence, performance allowances, and employee career management. The implication of the research findings is that in order to continue to improve the government's institutional performance, it is necessary to continue to make efforts to increase the integrity and loyalty of the State Civil Apparatus. These efforts can include continuous guidance to the State Civil Apparatus, Education and Training, giving reward and punishment, improving welfare, enforcing discipline, and other important efforts in accordance with the prevailing laws and regulations.

References

Adi, Y. (2018). Bureaucratic Reform to the improvement of public services Challenges for Indonesia. Publikauma : Jurnal Administrasi Publik Universitas Medan Area, 6(1), 15. https://doi.org/10.31289/publika.v6i1.1494

Ariño, A. (2003). Measures of strategic alliance performance: An analysis of construct validity. Journal of International Business Studies, 34(1), 66–79. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400005

Bobâlcă, C., Gătej(Bradu), C., & Ciobanu, O. (2012). Developing a Scale to Measure Customer Loyalty. Procedia Economics and Finance, 3, 623–628. https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671(12)00205-5

Chen, S., Xu, K., & Yao, X. (2022). Empirical study of employee loyalty and satisfaction in the mining industry using structural equation modeling. Scientific Reports, 12(1), 1158. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-05182-2

Church, M. (1993). Motivation and work behavior. In Long Range Planning (Vol. 26, Issue 1). McGraw-Hill. https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-6301(93)90245-b

Dutta, T., & Dhir, S. (2021). Employee Loyalty: Measurement and Validation. Global Business Review, 0972150921990809. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150921990809

El Araby, M. A., & Ayaad, N. el D. S. (2020). Dilemma of institutional performance assessment in governmental sector. Journal of Humanities and Applied Social Sciences, 2(2), 115–139. https://doi.org/10.1108/jhass-08-2019-0026

Fryer, K., Antony, J., & Ogden, S. (2009). Performance management in the public sector. International Journal of Public Sector Management, 22(6), 478–498. https://doi.org/10.1108/09513550910982850

Ghozali, Imam. 2013. Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 21 Update PLS Regresi. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro

Govekar, P. L., & Nelly Trevinyo-Rodreguez, R. (2007). Integrity: A systems theory classification. Journal of Management History, 13(1), 74–93. https://doi.org/10.1108/17511340710715188

Guillon, O., & Cezanne, C. (2014). Employee loyalty and organizational performance: A critical survey. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 27(5), 839–850. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-02-2014-0025

Hajdin, M. (2005). Employee loyalty: An examination. Journal of Business Ethics, 59(3), 259–280. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-005-3438-4

Halili, H., & Mochtar, Z. A. (2009). Tingkat Integritas Instansi Pelayanan BPN dan Samsat di Provinsi DIY. Mimbar Hukum, 21(3), 575–588. https://doi.org/10.22146/jmh.16282

Haryatmoko, W. (2011). Etika Publik untuk integritas Pejabat publik dan Politisi. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Huberts, L. W. J. C. (2018). Integrity: What it is and Why it is Important. Public Integrity, 20(sup1), S18–S32. https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2018.1477404

Jeremy, P. (2003). Strategi Memberantas Korupsi: Elemen Sistem Integritas Nasional. Transparency Internasioanl Indonesia bekerja sama dengan Yayasan Obor Indonesia.

Killinger, B. (2007). Integrity: Doing the right thing for the right reason. In Integrity: Doing the Right Thing for the Right Reason. McGill-Queen's University Press. https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.45-4080

McMullan, R., & Gilmore, A. (2003). The conceptual development of customer loyalty measurement: A proposed scale. Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing, 11(3), 230–243. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jt.5740080

Meschke, S. (2021). Employees in Organizations. In S. Meschke (Ed.), Employee Loyalty (pp. 7–26). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68425-9_2

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). Consequences of Employee Commitment, Turnover, and Absenteeism. In R. T. Mowday, L. W. Porter, & R. M. B. T.-E. L. Steers (Eds.), Employee–Organization Linkages (pp. 135–168). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-509370-5.50010-1

Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14(2), 224–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(79)90072-1

Mutiarin, D. (2012). Integritas Pelayanan Publik Dalam Percepatan Reformasi Birokrasi di Daerah (Studi Kasus di Kabupaten Kutai Kartanegara).

Oliver, R. L. (1999). Whence Consumer Loyalty? Journal of Marketing, 63(4_suppl1), 33–44. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222429990634s105

Pritchard, M. P., Howard, D. R., & Havitz, M. E. (1992). Loyalty measurement: A critical examination and theoretical extension. Leisure Sciences, 14(2), 155–164. https://doi.org/10.1080/01490409209513164

Sellars, S. (2020). What is professional? British Dental Journal, 228(8), 571. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41415-020-1532-8

Sihombing, S. O. (2018). Youth perceptions toward corruption and integrity: Indonesian context. Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences, 39(2), 299–304. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kjss.2018.03.004

Surat Edaran Menteri Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi Nomor 22 Tahun 2021 tentang Peningkatan Integritas Aparatur Sipil Negara

Yee, R. W. Y., Yeung, A. C. L., & Edwin Cheng, T. C. (2010). An empirical study of employee loyalty, service quality and firm performance in the service industry. International Journal of Production Economics, 124(1), 109–120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2009.10.015

Zdaniuk, B., & Levine, J. M. (2001). Group loyalty: Impact of members' identification and contributions. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37(6), 502–509. https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.2000.1474